

## ANSWERING ISKCON

≡ MENU



## Purana classification and Matsya Purana verses clarification.

february 19, 2022 by publisher, posted in arguments against iskcon, purana categorisation related arguments

It seems the stupidity of Iskcon knows no bounds, following is what they have stated

**“The respective works of Yamunacharya and Ramanuja which quote this passage are Agama-prAmANya and vEdArtha-saMgraha. sāttvikeṣu purāṇeṣu mātmyamadhikam hareḥ /”**

Now does Vedartha Samgraha even quote this ? This is something to be considered. They also have the following argument

**“Now losers can say padma puran is interpolated but but wait this verse was quoted by sripad Ramanujacharya ji and Yamunacharya ji in 12th century debates along**

with the whole host vedantist. And the verse from matsya puran was quoted by sripad Ramanujacharya ji and Yamunacharya in vedant sangrah“

So the claim here is that Vedartha Samgraha quotes Padma Purana. Since Sri Ramanuja is in the 12th century he quotes this in his Vedartha Samgraha. Also some Iskconites claim that the verses quoted in Skanda Purana which talk about Tamasatva of Vaishnava Puranas is later 15th century addition and so on. Now we do not know on what basis they say this, we don't know, maximum they will say no Acharya quoted it before that. We will not go into why this argument does not work. We will simply examine the claim of Iskcon, in order to make a claim they need to show some basis, Iskcon as usual fails to show basis for it's claims. 1st thing to be clarified here is that the quotation in the Vedarthasamgraha is from Matsya Purana, not Padma Purana. Also this particular section talks about the Satwika, Rajasika and Tamasika Kalpas. It does not talk about Puranas as such. This problem here is that, Iskconites are desperate to the core, they just heard something, Vedartha Samgraha of Sri Ramanuja has this, they do not bother to give reference or exact verses. Following is what Shri Ramanuja says, please find the screen shot below along with translation.

#### VEDĀRTHA-SAṅGRAHA

103

रजस्तमोभ्यामस्पृष्टम् उत्तमं सत्त्वमेव येषां स्वाभाविको गुणः तेषामेव  
वेदिकी हचिः वेदार्ययायात्म्यावबोधश्च इत्यर्थः । यथोक्तं मात्स्ये —

सङ्कीर्णाः सात्त्विकाश्चैव राजसाः तामसास्तथा ॥ इति ।

केचिद्ब्रह्मकल्पाः सङ्कीर्णाः, केचित् सत्त्वप्रायाः, केचित् रजःप्रायाः,  
केचित् तमःप्रायाः इति कल्पविभागमुक्त्वा, सत्त्वरजस्तमोमयानां तत्त्वानां  
माहात्म्यवर्णनञ्च तत्तत्कल्पप्रोक्तपुराणेषु सत्त्वादिगुणमयेन ब्रह्मणा क्रियते  
इति च उक्तम्;

यस्मिन् कल्पे तु यत्प्रोक्तं पुराणं ब्रह्मणा पुरा ।

तस्य तस्य तु माहात्म्यं तत्स्वरूपेण वर्ण्यते ॥ इति ।

विशेषतश्च उक्तम् —

अग्नेदिशवस्य माहात्म्यं तामसेषु प्रकीर्त्यते ।

राजसेषु च माहात्म्यम् अधिकं ब्रह्मणो विदुः ॥

सात्त्विकेष्वयं कल्पेषु माहात्म्यमधिकं हरेः ।

तेष्वेव योगसंसिद्धाः गमिष्यन्ति परां गतिम् ॥

सङ्कीर्णेषु सरस्वत्याः पितृणाम् . . . . इत्यादि ॥

**131.** That even the followers of the Vedas, who take a wrong view of things, are to be judged on a footing of equality with the non-Vedic thinkers has been laid down by Manu himself. He says, 'The smritis that are non-Vedic and the views that are perverse, are futile, being established in *tamas* (XII, 96)'. Only those who have *sattva* uncontaminated by *rajas* and *tamas* as their innate propensity have a taste for the Vedas and an understanding of the real contents of the Vedas. *Matsyapurāṇa* accords with this proposition: 'There are four categories—the mixed, the *sāttvika*, the *rājasa* and the *tāmasa*'. Some epochs of *Brahma* are mixed, some are dominantly *sāttvika*, some are dominantly *rājasa* and some dominantly *tāmasa*. After this classification of epochs, it is stated that *Brahmā* dominated by the predominant quality of each epoch, proclaims the greatness of principles that

Now the 1st question I have to Iskconites is that in what way does this prove that there is a categorisation of Puranas into Satwika, Rajasika and Tamasika ? There is no classification of Puranas even present in the verses quoted by Shri Ramanujacharya.

2nd question, if the Padma Purana categorisation was present during the time of Shri Ramanujacharya, why did he not quote it in the Vedārtha Samgraha itself ? I mean the quotation is absent here, in fact in order to prove that Satvatva of Vaishnava related scriptures he takes the help of a Manusmṛiti quote then the Matsya Purana quote about the various Kalpas. So where is the question of Padma Purana quotes being present during the time of Shri Ramanujacharya ? If they are present why did Shri Ramanujacharya not quote them in his Vedārthasamgraha ? Does this not show desperation as well as the utter stupidity of Iskconites ? Also it is very easy to show that even if the Satwika, Rajasika and Tamasika Kalpas are shown in the Matsya Purana it does not necessarily prove that only Vishnu related scriptures are Satwik, why you may ask, since Bhagavat Gita 18.20 , 21 and 22 classifies the Satwika, Rajasika and Tamasika knowledge. We have also shown that both Vaishnava and Shaiva Puranas actually give Satwika knowledge which is Advaita knowledge. There is one more idiotic and moronic argument which Iskcon uses, they use the verse 13.28 to prove that 18.20 means something else, basically the translation of Prabhupada as follows,

### Chapter 13, Verse 28

One who sees the Supersoul accompanying the individual soul in all bodies and who understands that neither the soul nor the Supersoul is ever destroyed, actually sees.

But following are 3 more translations which show this to be completely different.

### English Translation By Swami Adidevananda

13.28 Who sees the supreme ruler dwelling alike in all bodies and never perishing when they perish, he sees indeed.

### English Translation by Shri Purohit Swami

13.28 He who can see the Supreme Lord in all beings, the Imperishable amidst the perishable, he it is who really sees.

### English Translation By Dr. S. Sankaranarayan

13.28. Whosoever perceives the Supreme Lord as abiding and as non-perishing in all beings alike, while they perish - he perceives properly.

So does this not prove without a doubt that Iskcon's arguments are nonsense ?

This is the problem, Iskcon comes up with all sorts of claims and we have to keep debunking them. 1st they said, the Skanda Purana verses quoted by me are not present in Skanda Purana, then when I showed them, they state that this is something later added into it, then they make a claim that Padma Purana verses are quoted by Shri Ramanuja in Vedarthasamgraha.

I want people to understand one thing clearly, stop trusting any claim that Iskcon makes, they are not trust worthy in anyway, they can go down to any pathetic extent. The ways of Iskcon include, lying, personalised attacks, spamming, hitting below the belt and so on. This is what Iskcon's methods are all about, and also stop calling Iskconites as Vaishnavas, they are Abrahamic slaves nothing more.

---

#### PREVIOUS POST

[Untenability of the Sampradaya argument by Iskcon-2](#)

---

#### NEXT POST

[Desparation of Vaishnavas to prove that Shankara considered Vishnu Paratvam Part-3](#)

---



## 2 THOUGHTS ON “PURANA CLASSIFICATION AND MATSYA PURANA VERSES CLARIFICATION.”



विवेकः (vivekaḥ)

february 19, 2022 at 7:48 pm

नमश्शिवायोम्। 🙏

mahodaya, It's very apparent that few many people at ISKCON are so desperate in disparaging Śivaḥ, they are still not understanding the meaning of guṇāḥ, Indeed all the names belongs to rudraḥ says Āśvalāyana gr̥hya sūtrāṇi, these people never ever understand things properly. At times they are superbly worst than rāmānujāḥ & mādhvāḥ, 1st they aren't sane, they aren't devotees & next to that these guys do not even know the language. They quote as if they've understood.

पुराणानां विभजनः based on त्रिगुणाः is definitely true, but each purāṇam classifies the set of purāṇāni differently. Therefore the statements are to be understood with adhikāra bhedaḥ & also It's a relative statement. Hence you cannot claim it absolutely. And also before all these things they've to understand why the classification has been done differently in garuḍa & padma & even before this what is mean by guṇāḥ. It's extremely wrong in considering that tamaḥ is ignorance w.r.t. पुराणानां विभजनः is concerned. guṇāḥ isn't just quality or even material modes of natures, contextually we'll have to understand the meanings.

And regarding their wrong quoting, as I have already stated, they don't know the language & they don't understand things properly as they aren't interest in tattvam nor that they are interested in bhaktiḥ, they just have stupid paradigms.

Any sane who knows the language follows Śāṅkarabhāṣyam & Śrīdharabhāṣyam, I'm comfortable with Śrīdharabhāṣyam of विष्णुपुराणम् & भागवतम्।

P.S.: I hope you follow the posts & comments of adbhutam wordpress blog as well.

★ Liked by [1 person](#)

Reply



विवेकः (vivekaḥ)

february 19, 2022 at 7:48 pm

many\* ~few many~

★ Like

[Reply](#)

**LEAVE A COMMENT**

---

[Blog at WordPress.com.](#)